



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
HISTORICAL PRESERVATION & HERITAGE COMMISSION

Old State House 150 Benefit Street Providence, RI 02903

Telephone 401-222-2678
TTY 401-222-3700

Fax 401-222-2968
www.preservation.ri.gov

MINUTES
RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL PRESERVATION & HERITAGE COMMISSION
STATE PRESERVATION GRANTS REVIEW PANEL
December 1, 2021

Location:
House Location, Rhode Island State House
82 Smith Street
Providence, RI 02903

I. MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms. Shantia Anderheggen
Mr. Pierson Booher, AIA, NCARB
Mr. Jeffrey Emidy
Ms. Molly Dickinson
Ms. Grace Gielink
Ms. Simidele Mabray
Dr. Ronald Onorato

STAFF PRESENT

Virginia Hesse, Principal Historical Architect
Katherine Pomplun, Principal Grants Coordinator
Sarah Zurier, Principal Special Projects Coordinator

1. Call to order
The meeting was called to order at 9:30am by Ms. Pomplun. presiding.
2. Introductions
Review Panelists and staff introduced themselves.
3. Overview
Ms. Pomplun explained the process for the meeting. The first phase will introduce the applications and ask Review Panelists to vote whether to remove the application from further discussion or to retain for further consideration. There is about \$1.2 million to award and about \$2.7 million in requests. The next step will be to discuss the applications

that have not been eliminated and to make recommendations for funding (or not) and at what amount.

Ms. Zurier noted that the Review Panel is tasked with making recommendations for the Commissioners who will meet on December 8 to make final decisions.

4. Election of Chairperson

Mr. Emidy nominated Dr. Onorato who accepted the nomination. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the nomination, and Dr. Onorato was appointed chair.

5. Discussion of applications

Ms. Pomplun noted that every Review Board member and staff person had filled out a conflict-of-interest form to indicate if they had conflicts with specific grant applications. Ms. Pomplun introduced each application. Review Panelists discussed whether each application should or should not be considered for funding by the Commission based on the evaluation rubric (provided as Appendix A to the minutes). Review Panelists who had identified conflicts of interest with particular applications did not participate in discussion or voting on those applications.

Providence Marine Corps of Artillery/Benefit Street Arsenal (\$126,500 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the PMCA organization, and the proposed project to install an elevator. Ms. Dickinson noted that group does not have any history of fundraising and have not opened to the public beyond hosting the occasional event for other organizations. Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Dr. Onorato, and Dr. Onorato, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, Mr. Booher, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor of the motion.

Borders Farm Preservation Inc. (\$49,867 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to address exterior repairs to the farmhouse and barn. Mr. Booher noted that the proposed scope of work consists primarily of general maintenance activities.

Mr. Booher made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and Dr. Onorato, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, Mr. Booher, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor of the motion.

Ms. Mabray arrived and introduced herself.

Mount Hope Farm/Cove Cabin (\$37,385.05 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore the Cove Cabin deck.

Ms. Anderheggen noted that the problem is self-imposed by the organization. Mr. Booher agreed but expressed concern that the organization would lose a revenue stream if the project is not completed.

Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Friends of Pomham Rocks Lighthouse (\$15,326.67 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to fabricate and install operational window shutters.

Ms. Anderheggen noted that the application was well written, but questioned the wisdom of installing operational wood shutters, which are difficult to maintain even in ideal conditions, on a building that is so exposed to the elements. Mr. Booher agreed and noted that although the project would restore the building's historic appearance, it would not have an impact on the use of the building. Mr. Emidy noted that the windows are already protected by storm windows.

Mr. Emidy made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Clouds Hill Victorian House Museum (\$49,866.67 request)

Ms. Anderheggen recused herself.

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore windows and doors. Ms. Gielink expressed concern about the impact of the project on the general public but noted that it would be beneficial for the organization to receive a grant and to be able to leverage funding for other projects. Dr. Onorato noted that the organization is in transition and trying to professionalize, and that receiving a grant would help them continue that effort. Mr. Emidy offered that a smaller grant amount might be best, as their capacity to provide match is still unproven.

Mr. Emidy made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Booher, and Mr. Emidy, Mr. Booher, Dr. Onorato, Ms. Mabray, Ms. Gielink, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Anderheggen abstained.

Scituate Preservation Society/North Scituate Grange Hall #39 (\$9,892.67 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to paint the exterior, repair/replace a chimney, and restore interior plaster. Mr. Emidy remarked on the amount of work on the building already completed by the organization using volunteer labor, and noted that they are asking for a very small grant. Ms. Gielink noted that the organization was active, responsive, and good at managing a recent grant from Preserve Rhode Island. Dr. Onorato noted that geographic distribution is considered in the grant selection criteria, and that we do not receive many applications from Scituate. Mr. Emidy made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

South County Art Association (\$28,600 request)

Ms. Anderheggen recused herself.

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to paint the exterior west elevation of Helme House. Ms. Gielink expressed skepticism of the recommendations SCAA has received and does not understand why the most recent efforts to paint Helme House have already failed. Ms. Dickinson noted that the organization is the crown jewel in Kingston Village, and asked the panel whether the proposed project would solve the underlying problem. Ms. Hesse noted that four prior grants to SCAA have involved painting, but they have not consulted with RIHPHC on the issues they are having; additionally, they have not demonstrated an ability to maintain their completed projects without RIHPHC grant support. Ms. Dickinson described SCAA's recent application the State Cultural Facilities Grant Program. Ms. Hesse confirmed that RIHPHC already holds a preservation easement on the building. Ms. Pomplun noted that SCAA is also eligible for assistance through RIHPHC's Certified Local Government grant program; she has recommended that SCAA apply for a planning grant in 2022 that could fund an architect's investigation of the issues they are having. Ms. Gielink noted that the order of projects proposed in the SPG application – repaint, then address underlying problems – is problematic, and planning is really what they need. Mr. Emidy made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and Mr. Emidy, Dr. Onorato, Ms. Dickinson, Mr. Booher, Ms. Mabray, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Anderheggen abstained.

Westerly Armory (\$150,000 request)

Mr. Booher recused himself.

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore the building's failing crenelations. Mr. Emidy expressed concerns that the SPG program has already provided support for the organization to rebuild the crenelations once before, and that we don't know the cause of the current failure. He suggested that further study into the cause of the problem before a project to complete the repairs would be a logical course of action. Ms. Gielink agreed that the organization should not act until they know what went wrong. Ms. Mabray noted that there could be serious safety concerns that will need to be addressed regardless of whether this application is funded. Ms. Hesse said that the crenelations have already been rebuilt three separate times; perhaps it's an original design flaw and the crenelations should not be rebuilt at all. Mr. Emidy made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and Mr. Emidy, Dr. Onorato, Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Mabray, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Booher abstained.

Newport Performing Arts Center (\$38,489 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore the decorative plaster of the theater's proscenium arch.

Ms. Dickinson described a recent visit to the theater, at which she was surprised at how unfinished the space still is after many years of restoration. She also described the grant request that NPAC submitted to RISCA and noted their excellent management of past grants. Dr. Onorato noted the large amount of state funding already provided to the project despite the building not having opened to the public. Ms. Hesse compared NPAC

to the United Theater in Westerly, which eventually received private investments to enable completion of the project.

Dr. Onorato made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and the Review Panel voted in favor of the motion.

South County History Center (\$42,075 request)

Ms. Anderheggen recused herself.

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace the roof and complete other exterior repairs at the Old Washington County Jail.

Mr. Booher found the application challenging because the reach of the organization is limited, but appreciated the proactive approach to replace the roof before it begins to fail.

Ms. Dickinson did not think the application made a strong case for the historic significance of the building. Dr. Onorato confirmed that its significance is fairly high.

Ms. Dickinson noted that the funding worksheet did not specify a plan to fundraise the match, and that it appeared to add up incorrectly.

Mr. Booher made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and Ms. Anderheggen, Mr. Booher, Mr. Emidy, Ms.

Gielink, Ms. Mabray, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Anderheggen abstained.

Cranston Historical Society (\$48,400 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace air conditioning units at Sprague Mansion.

Ms. Gielink understood the applicant's argument that the project would enable the organization to serve more people but was not convinced that the proposed work is truly a preservation project. She also noted the lack of available funding to match the project.

Mr. Booher noted concerns about the funding shortfall and organizational capacity. Ms.

Dickinson noted that the 990 form was missing from the application. Ms. Mabray opined that the HVAC needs amount to a maintenance issue, not a restoration issue. Ms. Zurier noted that this would be the first grant to a site in Cranston. The group discussed the applicability of HVAC projects to the grant program in general.

Dr. Onorato made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Foster Preservation Society/Winsor Blacksmith Shop (\$11,900 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace the roof and complete other exterior repairs at the Winsor Blacksmith Shop. She noted that the Commission had voted in favor of recognizing the property as eligible for the State Register at their November 10, 2021 meeting. Ms. Anderheggen noted that roofs are a priority and pointed out the organization's diversity efforts. Ms. Gielink agreed. Dr. Onorato noted that the building is a rare building type, the application ranks high for geographic distribution, and the organization has past grant experience. Ms. Mabray noted the necessity of the work and the small amount of funding required.

Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The

motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Historic Metcalf-Franklin Farm Preservation Association/Franklin Farmhouse
(\$150,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed interior rehabilitation of Franklin Farmhouse.

Dr. Onorato said that use of the building is limited, and the site is primarily used as a working farm – which was also a concern when a grant was previously made for the site. He also noted the modest significance of the building. Mr. Emidy expressed concerns about plans to create a caretaker's apartment and the applicability of that piece of the scope to the grant program. Ms. Anderheggen thought that the proposed replacement of non-original windows was worthwhile, noted that there is value in experiencing the building as part of the landscape, and expressed concern about plans to widen interior doors. She also noted that the farm and its activities to reduce food insecurity are a good reuse of a historic property and that the letters of support and financials submitted with the application are strong. Dr. Onorato asked about what say RIHPHC would have in decisions such as widening the doors. Ms. Pomplun explained that RIHPHC has an exterior-only easement on the property, but if they receive a grant now for a project that includes elements of the interior rehabilitation, RIHPHC approval of those project elements would be required.

Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Dr. Onorato, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Block Island Southeast Lighthouse Foundation (\$150,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed exterior restoration at Block Island Southeast Lighthouse.

Mr. Booher felt positively about the application and noted that with limited revenue sources, the organization would get a lot of value out of a grant. Dr. Onorato supported it as well but wished to debate the amount of funding requested. Mr. Emidy noted some concerns about funding the site, which has received significant past grant support. Ms. Hesse questioned the wisdom in the recent restoration of the lighthouse interior before addressing critical exterior needs. Ms. Anderheggen concurred. Ms. Mabray noted the project's limited impact on underserved communities and lack of match.

Mr. Emidy made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Fort Adams Trust (\$150,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to waterproof and stabilize the Southwest Barracks at Fort Adams.

Dr. Onorato asked whether they had received a previous grant. Ms. Pomplun described multiple grants to both DEM and the Fort Adams Trust for buildings at the Fort. Ms. Gielink asked if the Trust identified a future use for the space and why they are mothballing it. Ms. Pomplun explained they intend to eventually interpret the space. Mr.

Booher asked if there is a consultant who developed the plan. Ms. Pomplun replied that an estimate for the project was provided by Gnazzo Company. Mr. Booher expressed concerns that the proposed project may not have been studied enough yet. Ms. Mabray said that the Trust needs to engage consultants to figure out the best way to move forward with preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration, because they need all three for this part of the building. She noted how unsafe the space currently is and strongly encouraged grant support to prevent further deterioration. Mr. Emidy noted that such a project will not increase access to the site, however – when you are in the parade ground and experiencing the fort, you experience that elevation, and letting it continue to rot does not seem like a good idea. Mr. Emidy also questioned whether shutters are a good solution. Ms. Hesse noted that other pieces of the fort are already gone, and preserving this section is important. Mr. Booher expressed concern that they may be doing some activities out of order, and would prefer they engage a consultant to study the space first. Dr. Onorato asked about the ownership of the site. Ms. Pomplun explained that the Fort is a state property, but the Trust, which is chartered by the state, fundraises on behalf of the fort. Ms. Dickinson noted that the application seemed rushed. Ms. Zurier suggested a CLG grant for planning might be appropriate. Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mabray, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Friends of Rogers Free Library (\$70,400 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace the library's slate roof.

Ms. Gielink asked whether previous work referenced in the application equates to patch repairs or prior roof replacement. Ms. Pomplun confirmed prior patch repairs and repairs to damaged interior plaster. Ms. Gielink noted that the condition seems fairly urgent but the applicant appears to be in a stronger financial position than many other applicants.

Mr. Emidy agreed and questioned whether the applicant could complete the project without RIHPHC funding, noting that SPG funding available is limited. Dr. Onorato questioned whether a project should be eliminated solely on the grounds of not having a financial need. Mr. Emidy said no. Ms. Mabray noted the applicant's assets of \$2.5m. Ms. Zurier commended the applicant's impulse to do good preservation work. Dr. Onorato agreed that small, well-funded organization should not be penalized. Ms. Pomplun reminded the panel to also consider geographic distribution in its evaluation. Mr. Emidy made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

East Providence Historical Society (\$29,220 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to upgrade storm windows and doors at Hunt House, complete exterior repairs at the Education Center, and reconstruct shelving and remove heavy equipment from the Garden Center.

Dr. Onorato noted the importance of geographic distribution of funded projects, but questioned the appropriateness of the funding for the planned work relating to the Garden

Center. Ms. Gielink questioned why the Education Center, which was recently restored, needs exterior work. Ms. Pomplun described a recent site visit to the building, and explained that the RISCA-funded Education Center project rehabbed the interior of the building, but exterior work was minimal. Ms. Gielink expressed some confusion about whether the doors in question are storm doors or actual doors. Ms. Dickinson confirmed that RISCA awarded the site a grant in 2016 and opined that the project seemed like a good value with good visibility and use of the property. Ms. Dickinson made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

PPAC (\$150,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace PPAC's North roof.

Dr. Onorato asked how many applications are for sites in Providence. Ms. Gielink confirmed there are seven. Ms. Dickinson noted that PPAC has also applied to RISCA for building an addition on the roof of the 1-story dressing room wing of the theater. Ms. Gielink described a recent visit to the roof during which she did not perceive any issues or problems. Mr. Booher noted that the roof is concealed and not public-facing, and wondered how the group feels about funding for non-historic materials like an EPDM roof. Ms. Hesse concurred and noted a lack of enthusiasm for funding non-historic features. Ms. Dickinson noted that there were no photos documenting water infiltration into the building, and that the financial position of the organization is incredibly strong. Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dickinson, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

First Congregational Church in Bristol (\$150,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore gothic window sash, repair plaster, and paint at FCC Bristol.

Dr. Onorato said there are issues with public access and noted that non-religious programming is not happening in the space that is proposed for grant assistance. Mr. Booher agreed but noted that problems in the sanctuary are likely difficult to isolate from impacting adjacent spaces. Mr. Emidy reiterated concerns about the location of public programs. Ms. Zurier questioned whether the public would recognize that a grant to this site would be a grant to a public historic site, a cultural arts center or a museum.

Dr. Onorato made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and Mr. Emidy, Ms. Gielink, Ms. Anderheggen, Dr. Onorato, and Ms. Anderheggen voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Booher and Ms. Mabray voted against.

Herreshoff Marine Museum/Burnside Building (\$150,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to continue the exterior restoration of the Burnside Building.

Dr. Onorato said that this is a good small organization and an interesting building type, and that the building has come a long way in terms of public programming since it last

received grant support in 2015. Ms. Dickinson noted that the application did not make clear how much of the building is commercial rental space vs. museum program space and recommended that any grant amount awarded be proportional to the amount of space being used for museum activities. Ms. Anderheggen agreed, and noted that the scope of work presented was somewhat confusing. Ms. Zurier noted that the project has received prior public support, and that the Champlin Foundation has expressed an interest in the building.

Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and Ms. Anderheggen, Mr. Booher, Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Gielink, Ms. Mabray, and Dr. Onorato voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Emidy voted against.

La Farge Restoration Fund/former Newport Congregational Church (\$150,000 request)
Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to continue mural restoration and complete critical repairs to the failing ceiling at Newport Congregational Church.

Ms. Dickinson described the organization's separate grant request to RISCA for an ADA accessibility project and noted the catch – the applicant needs ADA access to realize its mission of becoming a museum and cultural venue, but even if ADA access is provided, the building must remain closed until the safety issue of the ceiling is addressed. Mr. Emidy asked if Champlin also gave a grant for the ADA access. Ms. Dickinson confirmed that they did, and that the Champlin funding will match the RISCA project. Dr. Onorato expressed mixed feelings about the application, noting the significance of the murals, the lack of public impact, and the amount of funding already provided. Ms. Anderheggen asked how many applications came from Newport. Ms. Gielink confirmed six. Mr. Booher expressed concerns with the organization's financial health, despite their past success at obtaining grant funding. Ms. Pomplun noted that the applicant considered applying for an emergency grant last winter when they became aware of the ceiling problems but chose to enter the competitive grant round instead. Ms. Zurier suggested a CLG grant for planning around programming might be an option for the organization. Ms. Dickinson made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Dr. Onorato, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

BREAK

Newport Restoration Foundation/Vernon House (\$150,000 request)

Mr. Booher and Ms. Anderheggen recused themselves.

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to complete structural repairs at Vernon House.

Dr. Onorato noted the high level of significance of the building and explained that it is typically host to classes, tours, and other programming. Dr. Onorato made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and Dr. Onorato, Ms. Gielink, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Emidy voted against. Mr. Booher and Ms. Anderheggen abstained.

Rhode Island Historical Society/John Brown House (\$47,666.67 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to paint the historic roof-level wooden trim at John Brown House.

Ms. Anderheggen noted an affection for balustrades, because they are difficult to maintain, but noted disappointment in the lack of letters of support. Ms. Anderheggen made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. Mr. Booher expressed opposition to the request, citing concerns about holes in the application, and potential issues they do not appear to have considered such as hazardous materials.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Onorato. Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, Dr. Onorato, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Mabray, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Booher voted against.

The Steel Yard (\$38,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to complete window and other exterior repairs at the Community Art Building.

Mr. Booher noted the pandemic-related financial setbacks suffered by the organization and commended their community impact.

Mr. Booher made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Friends of Linden Place (\$28,112.33 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore Linden Place's gothic conservatory addition and first-floor bathroom.

Ms. Gielink noted the historic nature of the bathroom and wondered whether the size of the space would still present an accessibility issue. Mr. Booher and Mr. Emidy echoed that question.

Dr. Onorato made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gielink, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

International Tennis Hall of Fame (\$111,430 request)

Mr. Booher and Ms. Dickinson recused themselves.

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore the floor of the 2nd story porch on the Bellevue Avenue façade.

Dr. Onorato expressed concern about staff turnover at the museum and confusion about the scope, noting that it is not a clear-cut project and they do not propose restoring the porch to its original design. He also noted the building's high degree of significance.

Dr. Onorato made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen.

Mr. Emidy opined that this project is very expensive, with basically zero visibility. He also questioned whether the project will at all impact the visitor experience and noted that it is up against many strong applications from Newport.

Ms. Gielink, Ms. Mabray, and Dr. Onorato voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Emidy and Ms. Anderheggen voted against. Ms. Booher and Ms. Dickinson abstained.

City of Providence/Museum of Natural History (\$88,236.50 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace non-historic doors and improve access and security.

Mr. Booher noted that the application seemed to contain more “wants” than “needs.”

Mr. Booher made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Historic New England/Watson Farm Barn (\$75,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace the barn roof in-kind and to replace the failing wooden gutter system with a stainless-steel system.

Ms. Gielink liked the application and thought that the justification provided for stainless gutters was smart and innovative.

Ms. Gielink made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Booher, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

The Preservation Society of Newport County/The Elms (\$74,250 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to restore windows and doors at The Elms.

Mr. Emidy made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Booher. Dr. Onorato expressed concern in the institutional capacity for preservation, as the organization is now very tourist-driven. Ms. Dickinson also offered that she has concerns. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Providence Athenaeum (\$150,000 request)

Ms. Zurier noted for the record that she had a conflict of interest and did not participate in the staff discussion nor the Review Panel discussion.

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the organization, and the proposed project to replace the Athenaeum’s 100-year old heating system.

Ms. Hesse informed the panel that RIHPHC has received a request from the Athenaeum for approval of the project per the requirements of federal funding received from the National Endowment for the Humanities; she is concerned about the lack of engineering involved. Mr. Emidy noted the large amount of past SPG support for the site, the significant amount of contractor overhead in the budget, and the support already received from other funders for the current project.

Mr. Emidy made a motion to remove the application from consideration. The motion was seconded by Dr. Onorato. Ms. Anderheggen voiced her concern that the project might be better off with an RIHPHC grant and oversight. Mr. Emidy reiterated that RIHPHC does have oversight through the Section 106 process as a result of the NEH grant. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

City of Central Falls/Cogswell Tower (\$150,000 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the applicant, and the proposed project to fully rehabilitate Cogswell Tower in Jenks Park.

Mr. Emidy explained that this is likely to be part of a larger project in Jenks Park; the Commission has received requests to review design development for the park.

Mr. Emidy made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dickinson, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Pawtucket Public Library (\$58,042.88 request)

Ms. Pomplun described the application, the applicant, and the proposed project to complete exterior repairs and address water infiltration at the Sayles Building.

Ms. Dickinson made a motion to retain the application for further consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderheggen, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

BREAK FOR LUNCH

6. Grant amount adjustments

Ms. Pomplun announced that there are 21 projects requesting \$1.8 million remaining under consideration, and that there is \$1.2 million available for grants. This includes \$1 million from the March 2021 bond issue, as well as approximately \$337,000 from past grant rounds, minus \$5,000 for bond fees and approximately \$150,000 to retain for cost overruns and emergencies.

Ms. Pomplun said that six applications still under consideration are for Small Project grants (total project cost of up to \$75,000 with a two-to-one matching requirement), and fifteen are for Large grants (more than \$75,000 total project cost with a one-to-one matching requirement). She put forward a slate of the six Small Project applications for consideration: Scituate Preservation Society/Grange #39, Foster Preservation Society/Winsor Blacksmith Shop, East Providence Historical Society, Friends of Linden Place, Rhode Island Historical Society/John Brown House, Clouds Hill Victorian House Museum. Mr. Emidy made a motion to recommend the six Small Project applications for potential funding and return to adjusting their budgets later, if necessary. Mr. Onorato seconded this motion, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

Ms. Pomplun reintroduced each of the 15 Large Project applications that remained under consideration.

South County History Center

Ms. Anderheggen recused herself.

Ms. Dickinson said her opinion of the application is higher after the earlier discussion of the building's significance. Mr. Booher agreed that although it may have scored low, it is a good project. Dr. Onorato noted that they are an organization that does a lot with very little.

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$42,075. Mr. Booher seconded this motion, and Mr. Booher, Ms. Gielink, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Mabray, and Dr. Onorato voted in favor. Ms. Anderheggen abstained.

Historic Metcalf-Franklin Farm Preservation Association/Franklin Farmhouse

Ms. Gielink said that the project budget does not identify which specific elements of the scope of work would be supported by the grant. Ms. Zurier suggested that the panel could consider a smaller grant amount. Mr. Emidy suggested a grant of up to \$75,000, but potentially less, that specifies specific areas of the building and project work items for funding. Ms. Hesse suggested specifying that the funding not be spent on elements of the caretaker's apartment. The Panel concurred. Ms. Pomplun explained that staff will work with every grantee to define the final scope of work; this project would be no exception. Ms. Gielink pointed out that the largest item in the budget is under mechanicals, and that's still very unclear.

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$75,000. Ms. Anderheggen seconded this motion, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

Pawtucket Public Library

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend full funding at \$58,042.88, and Ms. Anderheggen seconded this motion. Ms. Pomplun noted that for grant administration purposes, the Review Panel has typically recommended "round numbers" for funding. Dr. Onorato amended his motion to recommend funding at \$58,100, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

City of Central Falls/Cogswell Tower

Mr. Emidy motioned to recommend funding at \$150,000. Ms. Dickinson seconded this motion, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

The Preservation Society of Newport County/The Elms

Ms. Anderheggen suggested a partial grant for this project, citing PSNC fundraising capacity.

Ms. Anderheggen motioned to recommend funding at \$50,000. Dr. Onorato seconded the motion. Ms. Dickinson added that the application was short on community letters of support. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Historic New England/Watson Farm Barn

Mr. Booher flagged discrepancies in the project budget worksheet relating to the base bid and alternates provided on the contractor's estimate submitted with the application.

Mr. Booher motioned to recommend a reduced grant amount of \$62,865 based on the amount of the base bid. Ms. Pomplun explained the budget worksheet and contingency requirements further. Mr. Booher amended his motion to recommend funding at \$69,000 (including contingency). Dr. Onorato seconded this motion. Ms. Anderheggen expressed concern with a lack of roof maintenance as evidenced in the application photographs and would recommend \$50,000. Mr. Emidy offered that reducing funding amounts has to be done carefully, and the amount should still be sufficient to complete the project. Ms.

Hesse added that historic barns that are still used as barns are very rare. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

City of Providence/Museum of Natural History

Mr. Emidy motioned to recommend funding at \$88,500. Dr. Onorato seconded this motion. Mr. Booher noted his support of the application, described a recent visit to the site, and expressed concerns about how the applicant will execute the planned accessibility upgrades. He noted the project seems trickier than it might appear on paper. Ms. Pomplun offered that the Review Panel may increase funding request amounts if they conclude more funding may be necessary to complete the proposed project. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

International Tennis Hall of Fame

Ms. Dickinson and Mr. Booher recused themselves.

Ms. Pomplun displayed the project budget and relayed a conversation with the applicant about the estimates. Dr. Onorato stated that the project is very unclear to him. Ms. Hesse noted that the photos included in the application do not show any damage or impact to the archway beneath the porch. Dr. Onorato also noted that the porch is not used by visitors to the museum, but the applicant is suggesting they could use it if the project were completed. Ms. Hesse questioned whether visitors on the porch unaccompanied would be a safety issue for the museum. Dr. Onorato added that there is not enough detail in the budget. Ms. Mabray agreed. Dr. Onorato made a motion not to recommend funding. Ms. Anderheggen seconded the motion, and Mr. Emidy, Ms. Anderheggen, Dr. Onorato, Ms. Mabray, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor. Mr. Booher and Ms. Dickinson abstained.

The Steel Yard

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$38,000. Ms. Gielink seconded this motion. Ms. Dickinson described the applicant's request to RISCA for funding for an ADA-accessible entrance to this building. She noted that the building is rented to tenants and asked the group whether this was appropriate. Dr. Onorato asked whether "Community" means the Steel Yard community, or other programming. Ms. Dickinson described the programming offered by the building's tenants. Ms. Hesse noted they did not include interior photographs in the application. Ms. Gielink opined that of all the applications, this one seemed to have the most versatile use and biggest reach. Ms. Dickinson expressed a preference for funding areas of the building used by the applicant vs. those used by the tenants. Ms. Pomplun described that the public actually uses the tenant space more than the areas used by the Steel Yard, which are offices. Ms. Mabray noted that grant assistance for this project will allow them to allow the tenants to use the space without raising the rent, which is already below market rate. Ms. Dickinson agreed that the arrangement supports other small non-profits. Ms. Hesse added that they are restoring steel windows, a rare feature. Ms. Zurier described the building as an incubator and noted that tenants may change, and added that she was impressed with the applicants' commitment to breaking down barriers to access on the entire campus. Mr. Emidy amended the motion to remove the line item related to the awnings, as we have no historic images of the feature, and to fund the project at \$36,400. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

Newport Restoration Foundation/Vernon House

Ms. Anderheggen and Mr. Booher recused themselves.

Ms. Hesse recalled being in the building in the past, noted that the rooms are not large enough to support big gatherings of people, and questioned the need for all the work proposed in the application. Mr. Onorato agreed that the project seems over-engineered. Ms. Mabray asked whether the request is to repair structural issues, or proactively reinforce the structure. Ms. Hesse described the project as reinforcement, and opined that the request amount seems very high for a wood-frame house. Ms. Pomplun displayed the engineer's cost estimate. Ms. Zurier noted that more planning seems necessary and funding it now seems premature. Ms. Dickinson expressed concern about reinforcing the first floor to support 100 psf, noting that 40 psf is acceptable for a parking garage. Mr. Onorato suggested removing the \$75,000 line item to reinforce the floor from the budget. Mr. Emidy suggested reviewing the line items to identify those that should receive funding instead of cutting the total project by \$75,000, as that cut would still result in a \$150,000 grant. Ms. Dickinson suggested tabling the conversation and returning to decide after discussing other projects.

Mr. Emidy motioned to table this application. Ms. Dickinson seconded this motion, and Dr. Onorato, Ms. Mabray, Ms. Gielink, Ms. Dickinson, and Mr. Emidy voted in favor.

La Farge Restoration Fund/former Newport Congregational Church

Ms. Hesse suggested looking at this application differently because it is an emergency. Ms. Pomplun described that leftover funding previously available for emergency applications has been recaptured and is included in the total amount now available for grants. Dr. Onorato questioned the organization's programming commitment and encouraged consistency across applications. He added that the project does seem like a true emergency. Mr. Booher asked whether the murals are a contributing factor to the building's National Register status. The group confirmed that the murals are paramount to the building's significance. Ms. Dickinson referenced the applicant's request to RISCA for an ADA-accessibility project, noting that if both the ceiling stabilization and the ADA project are completed, the organization can begin programming the space and leveraging public support for additional phases of restoration. Ms. Anderheggen opined that the interior decoration is incredibly important and noted that the applicant organization has been working steadily towards restoration for over 10 years. Mr. Emidy noted that funding this request would essentially be a step to save the most important thing about this building, whereas other requests propose work that is good for the building but isn't as critical. Dr. Onorato notes that the line item in the budget for plaster ceiling consolidation appears to be the emergency element of the project. Ms. Pomplun agreed and suggested accepting that line item as the total project budget.

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding the ceiling repair at \$150,000. Mr. Booher seconded the motion, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

Herreshoff Marine Museum/Burnside Building

Mr. Emidy expressed concern about the amount of past support from the state for this building but noted that programming inside the building has improved since the last State Preservation Grant award in 2015. He also reported on an RIHPHC staff meeting with

Champlin Foundation staff, who were impressed with the organization's programming and noted an interest in funding the building, though they have not yet done so. Ms. Zurier noted an impact beyond Bristol, as the museum is serving audiences statewide through its boatbuilding programs. Ms. Anderheggen expressed some confusion with the budget. Ms. Pomplun noted that the applicant's budget is based on an older estimate, increased by 20% across the board.

Ms. Anderheggen motioned to recommend funding at \$75,000. Dr. Onorato seconded this motion, and Ms. Mabray, Dr. Onorato, Mr. Booher, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Dickinson, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor. Mr. Emidy voted against.

Rogers Free Library

Ms. Dickinson noted that the applicant appears to have other avenues for funding. Ms. Anderheggen motioned to recommend not funding this grant. Ms. Gielink seconded this motion. Dr. Onorato asked that staff convey to the applicant that the denial is not reflective of a bad project, but of limited available funding. The Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

Fort Adams Trust

Mr. Emidy suggested multiple options for funding the project, including a \$100,000 grant for the roof only; or a \$150,000 grant for the roof and however many parade-facing windows they could afford. Ms. Dickinson agreed with prioritizing the roof and encouraging further planning for the windows. Ms. Hesse noted that there are holes in the floor structure in front of the windows where water comes in and has worn it away; keeping the water out of the windows is critical as well. Mr. Booher encouraged looking at the project comprehensively to address the envelope as a whole. Mr. Emidy asked whether the proposed shutters would be temporary. Ms. Zurier noted that shutters were not a historic feature of the building. Ms. Anderheggen asked whether the application stated how many windows are involved. Mr. Booher confirmed 49 openings at \$2,000 per opening, and wondered how they arrived at this design solution, noting that an Allied storm window in each opening would be a quarter of the cost. Ms. Hesse opined that she would not have them rush to put historically correct windows in but would prefer that they mothball the space and install louvers until they can restore the interior. Ms. Zurier asked whether mothballing the building is truly an eligible project. Ms. Hesse replied that the roof would be permanent. Dr. Onorato reiterated the option to fund only the roof. Mr. Booher said he would support design and investigation only, but understands design only is not eligible for this program. Ms. Mabray agreed that is important to do the roof right now, and the best treatment for the windows is still unknown.

Ms. Anderheggen motioned to recommend funding at \$122,500 for the roof and A+E, to include determination of a solution for the window openings. Ms. Mabray seconded this motion, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

Ms. Marbray, citing a prior engagement, left the meeting during discussion of the Southeast Lighthouse application, before the vote was taken.

Southeast Lighthouse

Dr. Onorato noted that this is another site that has received a lot of past state support. Mr. Emidy agreed, and added that the exterior elements to be restored are important, but not critical like the most recent SPG award to Southeast Light from 2015. Ms. Hesse noted that a lot of the items in the scope are things RIHPHC has already funded in past grants. She added that the organization restored interior spaces before addressing these exterior needs.

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend not funding this request. Ms. Anderheggen seconded this motion, and the Review Panel voted unanimously in favor.

BREAK

Clouds Hill

Ms. Anderheggen recused herself.

Mr. Emidy moved to award Clouds Hill their full \$50,000 request, with the understanding that if they cannot raise the full match required, they will do a smaller project and return the unused funds to RIHPHC. Ms. Gielink seconded this motion, and Dr. Onorato, Mr. Booher, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Dickinson, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor. Ms. Anderheggen abstained.

East Providence Historical Society

Mr. Emidy suggested removing the Garden Center line items from the East Providence Historical Society grant request. Ms. Pomplun confirmed a revised grant amount of \$26,865 for all items not including the Garden Center. Mr. Emidy motioned to recommend funding at \$26,865. Ms. Gielink seconded this motion, and Dr. Onorato, Mr. Booher, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Anderheggen, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor.

Scituate Preservation Society/North Scituate Grange Hall #39

Ms. Gielink noted that the applicant should provide more plans for the chimney replacement and plaster repair. Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$9,900. Mr. Emidy seconded this motion, and Dr. Onorato, Mr. Booher, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Anderheggen, and Ms. Gielink in favor.

Foster Preservation Society/Winsor Blacksmith Shop

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$11,900. Mr. Booher seconded this motion, and Dr. Onorato, Mr. Booher, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Anderheggen, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor.

Rhode Island Historical Society/John Brown House

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$48,000. Mr. Emidy seconded this motion. Ms. Hesse noted that RIHPHC holds an easement on the property but RIHS has not consulted with staff on the necessary repairs. Ms. Anderheggen opined that if an easement property is out of compliance, they should not be funded. Dr. Onorato withdrew the motion.

Ms. Anderheggen motioned not to recommend funding, and Ms. Gielink seconded the motion. Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, and Mr. Booher voted for the motion, and Ms. Dickinson, Mr. Emidy, and Dr. Onorato voted against.

Ms. Anderheggen reiterated her concern about easement compliance. Ms. Pomplun noted that for the past two years, the applicant has been involved in easement review for their upcoming landscape project. Ms. Anderheggen wondered if the applicant considers the balustrade repairs to be maintenance that the easement allows them to do. Ms. Dickinson suggested recommending the project for funding pending staff confirmation that easement requirements have been met. Ms. Gielink asked whether we know for sure if the repair project has begun. Ms. Pomplun said no, and noted that when the applicant applied on October 1, the rotting wood had been discovered within the previous 10 days. Mr. Emidy noted the possibility that the applicant intends to consult with RIHPHC about the repairs, but hasn't yet. Ms. Hesse agreed that if the project has not started, they still have a chance to comply with the easement. Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$48,000 contingent on confirming the applicant's compliance with the existing preservation easements on the John Brown House. Ms. Anderheggen seconded the motion, and Mr. Emidy, Dr. Onorato, Ms. Gielink, Ms. Anderheggen, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor. Mr. Booher was opposed.

Friends of Linden Place

Dr. Onorato motioned to recommend funding at \$28,200. Ms. Anderheggen seconded this motion, and Dr. Onorato, Mr. Booher, Mr. Emidy, Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Anderheggen, and Ms. Gielink voted in favor.

Ms. Pomplun then confirmed the total amount of funding left to award. Mr. Onorato moved to fund Pawtucket Public Library, Cogswell Tower, Watson Farm, Roger Williams Park Museum, the Steel Yard, La Farge Restoration Fund, Burnside Building, Linden Place, and Franklin Farm at the previously agreed upon amount, and to hold the Elms and Vernon House for further discussion. Ms. Anderheggen seconded.

Ms. Gielink expressed additional concern about Franklin Farm. Mr. Onorato amended the motion to fund for Pawtucket Public Library, Cogswell Tower, Watson Farm, Roger Williams Park Museum, the Steel Yard, La Farge Restoration Fund, Burnside Building, and Linden Place at the previously agreed upon amount, and to hold the Elms, Vernon House, and Franklin Farm for further discussion. Dr. Onorato, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, Mr. Emidy, Mr. Booher, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor.

Historic Metcalf-Franklin Farm Preservation Association/Franklin Farmhouse

Ms. Gielink noted that the project is very complicated and there will be an onus on the staff to try to figure out the scope and details; she added that if we do fund it, we should be more specific. Mr. Emidy noted the reduction to the grant request agreed on by the panel was arbitrary. Ms. Anderheggen described her support for the project, noting that it will support the site programmatically, but requested that staff specifically define what the money will go towards given the concern about items in the scope. Ms. Gielink motioned to recommend funding at \$75,000 with staff direction on the scope of work. Ms. Anderheggen seconded the motion. Mr. Emidy noted that all grants are "not to exceed." Ms. Gielink amended the motion to recommend funding at no more than

\$75,000 with staff direction on the scope of work. Dr. Onorato, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, Mr. Emidy, Mr. Booher, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor.

Discussion of The Elms and Vernon House together ensued. Ms. Hesse reiterated her concern that the Vernon House request is premature for a very large project, noting that the applicant is in the process of losing their executive director, and a new director may have different priorities for the house. Dr. Onorato expressed strong support of funding at least the pier and sill repair at Vernon House. Ms. Hesse opined that the application did not make a strong case for the critical nature of the other elements of the project. Ms. Pomplun described what the remaining balance of available funding would be if the approved amount for The Elms were increased.

Newport Restoration Foundation/Vernon House

Mr. Booher and Ms. Anderheggen recused themselves.

Dr. Onorato voted to recommend funding at \$30,000 for a scope of sills and basement pier repairs. Ms. Gielink seconded the motion. Dr. Onorato and Ms. Gielink voted in favor, and Mr. Emidy and Ms. Dickinson voted against. Mr. Booher and Ms. Anderheggen abstained.

The Preservation Society of Newport County/The Elms

Ms. Anderheggen motioned to recommend funding at \$74,250. Mr. Booher seconded this motion, and Dr. Onorato, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, Mr. Emidy, Mr. Booher, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor.

Ms. Pomplun noted that a small balance of available funding remained after approving the final project and suggested looking at the Herreshoff Marine Museum request again, which was also arbitrarily reduced.

Herreshoff Marine Museum/Burnside Building

Mr. Emidy motioned to recommend funding at \$112,000. Dr. Onorato seconded the motion, and Dr. Onorato, Ms. Anderheggen, Ms. Gielink, Mr. Emidy, Mr. Booher, and Ms. Dickinson voted in favor.

7. Review of final recommendations for grant awards

Ms. Pomplun shared the working spreadsheet of recommendations for funding.

8. Other business

Mr. Onorato thanked the Panel for meeting to make recommendations to the Commission. The Commission will discuss the Review Panel's recommendations at their meeting on December 8, 2021.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Minutes recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Sarah Zurier". The signature is written in a cursive style and is placed on a light gray rectangular background.

Sarah Zurier
Principal Special Projects Coordinator

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Katherine J. Pomplun". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Katherine Pomplun
Principal Grants Coordinator

DRAFT

Appendix A: Evaluation Rubric

EVALUATION of APPLICATIONS for STATE PRESERVATION GRANTS

Adopted by the RIHPHC September 7, 2021

The following criteria are used to evaluate applications for State Preservation Grants. Applications may be awarded a maximum of 50 points. Overall scores may be used to rank and sort applications to facilitate discussion among reviewers. The Review Committee's final recommendations to the Commission for grant funding will be based on a statewide group of projects considering all the evaluation criteria.

(1) HISTORICAL/ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE (10 points): 1-10 points will rate the property's historical and architectural significance. Excellent projects will further the preservation of significant historic properties. This evaluation factor tries to measure the relative historical and architectural significance of applicants' properties.

- 1-3 points: properties that contribute to the overall significance of a historic district but lack individual significance.
- 4-6 points: properties within a historic district or individually registered that are very good examples of their type and/or important local landmarks.
- 7-10 points: properties that possess individual distinction and are considered significant when compared with other historic properties throughout the state.

(2) PROJECT NEED (10 points): 1-10 points will rate the project's physical preservation needs. Excellent projects will undertake restoration and construction work that is needed to preserve the historic property and to fulfill its mission as a museum or cultural art center or public historic site. This evaluation factor tries to measure the value of the proposed project work.

- 1-3 points: projects that do not address important historic features and that have little impact on the operation of the public historic site, museum, or cultural art center.
- 4-6 points: projects that make a long-term improvement and preserve character-defining features of the building and/or make a needed improvement to the building's function as a public historic site, museum, or cultural art center.
- 7-10 points: projects that address a significant threat to the building's preservation or restore unusually significant historic features, and/or make a crucial improvement to the building's function as a public historic site, museum, or cultural art center.

(3) PROJECT IMPACT (10 points): 1-10 points will rate the project's ability to serve the public and to attract support. Excellent projects will serve the larger community in addition to meeting a need of the historic property. This evaluation factor tries to measure the extent to which the completed project will benefit people who live in the community and recognizes public use of the public historic site, museum, or cultural art center. This factor also measures the ability of a State Preservation Grant to leverage other support for the project.

- 1-3 points: the project will serve relatively few people and will not significantly enhance public access, activities, or cultural programming.
- 4-6 points: the project will serve many people in its community; it will be visible; and it demonstrates local support.
- 7-10 points: the project will serve many people in its community and throughout its region or statewide; it will be highly visible; and it has generated widespread support in its own community and beyond.

(4) DISTRIBUTION (10 points): 1-10 points will rate the project's ability to address the needs of significantly underserved populations and/or will recognize the application as the strongest in its town or region. Excellent projects will increase access or engagement with historically marginalized communities or constituencies (BIPOC or people with disabilities, for examples) and/or take place in an underserved geographic location of the state. This evaluation factor tries to ensure equitable distribution of funded projects to communities statewide.

- 1-3 points: the project is not anticipated to lead to increased access or engagement with historically underserved communities; it will not take place in an underserved town or region
- 4-6 points: the project will impact underserved parts of the applicant's community and/or it will take place in an underserved town or region.
- 7-10 points: the project is anticipated to lead to increased access or engagement with historically underserved communities; it will impact underserved parts of the applicant's community; will take place in an underserved town or region; it is overall the strongest application submitted in its town or region.

(5) CAPACITY TO SUCCEED (10 points): 1-10 points will rate the applicant's organizational strength, fundraising, and financial and administrative capacity to complete a successful grant project. Excellent applicants will demonstrate their ability to supply matching funds, plan, and carry out a successful project within a 24-month period. This evaluation factor tries to measure the probability that an organization has the adequate experience, personnel, and financial controls to manage a State Preservation Grant.

- 1-3 points: the organization has limited experience with fundraising, grants management, or successful capital projects; and may be experiencing budget challenges.
- 4-6 points: the organization is fiscally sound, has experience with fundraising, grants management, and successful capital projects, and can demonstrate a strong track record of supplying matching funds for grant projects.
- 7-10 points: The organization has extensive experience with fundraising, grants management, and successful capital projects, is fiscally sound, and has matching funds in-hand at the time of application.

Appendix B: Spreadsheet of Funding Recommendations

Project Title	Town	Large or Small Project	Request Amount	Amount to Award 12/1/21
La Farge Restoration: Murals Completion Phase I	Newport	Large	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 150,000.00
Rehabilitation of Cogswell Tower	Central Falls	Large	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 150,000.00
Fort Adams – SW Barracks Waterproofing and Stabilization Project	Newport	Large	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 122,500.00
Burnside Building Restoration - Phase 3	Bristol	Large	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 112,000.00
Museum Access: Historic Restoration and Repair	Providence	Large	\$ 88,236.50	\$ 88,500.00
Interior rehabilitation of the historic 1857 Franklin Farm Farmhouse	Cumberland	Large	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 75,000.00
Window Restoration at The Elms	Newport	Large	\$ 74,250.00	\$ 74,250.00
Watson Farm Barn Roof and Gutter Preservation Project	Jamestown	Large	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 69,000.00
Deborah Cook Sayles Building Envelope Rehabilitation Project	Pawtucket	Large	\$ 58,042.88	\$ 58,100.00
Clouds Hill Museum 3rd Floor Windows and Basement Door Restoration	Warwick	Small	\$ 49,866.67	\$ 50,000.00
Crowning Achievement: Repairing and Painting the Upper Wooden Trim of the John Brown House Museum	Providence	Small	\$ 47,666.67	\$ 48,000.00
Roof Replacement and Masonry Repairs at South County History Center	South Kingstown	Large	\$ 42,075.00	\$ 42,075.00
Restoring the Community Art Building at the Steel Yard	Providence	Large	\$ 38,000.00	\$ 36,400.00
William Vernon House Structural Repairs	Newport	Large	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
Linden Place Gothic Conservatory Restoration	Bristol	Small	\$ 28,112.33	\$ 28,200.00
Preservation and Rehabilitation of the John Hunt House Museum and Education Center	East Providence	Small	\$ 29,220.00	\$ 26,865.00
Winsor Blacksmith shop roof, trim board, and drainage repairs	Foster	Small	\$ 11,900.00	\$ 11,900.00
Continued Restoration of Historic North Scituate Grange Hall #39	Scituate	Small	\$ 9,892.67	\$ 9,900.00
Southeast Lighthouse Exterior Restoration	Block Island	Large	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -
Roof Replacement	Bristol	Large	\$ 70,400.00	\$ -
Newport Casino - Restoration of Porch Floor / Vestibule Roof at Main Entrance	Newport	Large	\$ 111,430.00	\$ -
		Total:	\$ 1,784,092.72	\$ 1,182,690.00
			Available Funding:	\$ 1,183,000.00
			Difference:	\$ 310.00